

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
and California's Local Education Agency Plan (LEA Plan)
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) Program and Tobacco Use
Prevention Education (TUPE) – A Funded Program under NCLB**

Expanded Version of the Executive Summary

Purpose of this document: This is an expanded version of the Executive Summary addressing the waiver requirements of the California LEA Plan. Information for "Promising or Favorable Programs (Waiver Required)", p. 47 of LEA Plan is available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pr/leap/>.

Performance Goal 4: "All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning."

1. What does the "Building Effective Schools Together" (BEST) whole school intervention provide?

BEST (Sprague et al., 1999; 2003) provides a standardized staff development program aimed at improving school and classroom discipline in schools, and associated outcomes such as school violence, and alcohol, tobacco and other drug use. It is based on the Effective Behavioral Support (EBS) (Sugai and Horner, 1994, Sprague, Sugai and Walker, 1998; Sprague, Walker, Golly et al., 2002) model developed at the University of Oregon and the National Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) (an Office of Special Education Programs funded researched center). The mission of the BEST program is to facilitate the academic achievement and healthy social development of children and youth in a safe environment conducive to learning.

The program includes intervention techniques based on over 30 years of rigorous research regarding school discipline from education, public health, psychology, and criminology. Program components address whole-school, common area, classroom and individual student interventions and are intended to be used in combination with other evidence-based prevention programs such as the Second Step Violence Prevention Curriculum (Committee for Children, 2002). Representative school team members are trained to develop and implement positive school rules, rule teaching, positive reinforcement systems, data-based decision making at the school level, effective classroom management methods, and curriculum adaptation to prevent problem behavior, and functional behavioral assessment and positive behavioral intervention. Teams are also coached to integrate BEST with other prevention programs to maximize effectiveness.

2. What are the measurable outcomes of BEST?

Other researchers using similar and the same techniques have replicated Building Effective Schools Together and similar models. The effects of the intervention are documented in a series of studies implemented by researchers at the University of Oregon (Metzler et al., 2002; Sprague, Walker, Golly, et al., 2002; Taylor-Greene et al., 1997, see also www.pbis.org for the latest research studies and reports). Studies have shown reductions in office discipline referrals of up to 50%, with

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
and California's Local Education Agency Plan (LEA Plan)**

continued improvement over a three-year period in schools that sustain the intervention (Irvin, Tobin et al., in press). In addition, school staff report greater satisfaction with their work, compared to schools that did not implement B.E.S.T. Comparison schools show increases or no change in office referrals, along with general frustration with the school discipline program.

3. To what extent has prevalence of risk behaviors been prevented and protective factors, or assets been increased?

Studies are underway now to relate the quality of implementation to changes in student and staff behavior, as well as documenting changes in student attitudes and self-reported problem behavior.

In studies employing the components included in the BEST program, reductions in antisocial behavior (Sprague et al., 2002), vandalism (Mayer, 1995), aggression (Grossman et al., Lewis et al.), later delinquency (Kellam et al., 1998; O'Donnell et al., 1997), alcohol, tobacco and other drug use (Biglan et al., 2002; O'Donnell et al., 1997) have been documented. Positive changes in protective factors such as academic achievement (Kellam et al., O'Donnell et al., 1997) and school engagement (O'Donnell et al., 1997) have been documented using a positive school discipline program such as BEST in concert with other prevention interventions.

4. Supporting Bibliography

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Joepsell, T. D., Liu, P., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., Frey, K., & Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 277(20), 1605-1611.

Irvin, L.K., Tobin, T.J., Sprague, J.R., & Vincent, C.G. (in press). Validity of office discipline referrals measures as indices of school-wide behavioral status and effects of school-wide behavioral interventions. University of Oregon OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

Kellam, S. G., Mayer, L. S., Rebok, G. W., & Hawkins, W. E. (1998). Effects of improving achievement on aggressive behavior and of improving aggressive behavior on achievement through two preventive interventions: An investigation of causal paths. Dohrenwend, Bruce P. (Ed.), et al. *Adversity, stress, and psychopathology*. (pp. 486-505). New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press. xv, 567 pp.

Lewis, T. J, Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1998). Reducing problem behavior through a school-side system of effective behavioral support: Investigation of a school-wide social skills training program and contextual interventions. *School Psychology Review*, 27, 446-459.

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
and California's Local Education Agency Plan (LEA Plan)**

- Mayer, G. R. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 28(4), 467-478.
- Metzler, C.W., Biglan, A., Rusby, J.C., & Sprague, J.R. (2001). Evaluation of a comprehensive behavior management program to improve school-wide positive behavior support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24(4), 448-479.
- O'Donnell, J., Hawkins, J., Catalano, R., Abbott, R., Day, L. (1995). Preventing school failure, drug use, and delinquency among low-income children: long-term intervention in elementary schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 65:87-100.
- Sprague, J., Walker, H., Golly, A., White, K., Myers, D., Shannon, T. (2001). Translating research into effective practice: The effects of a universal staff and student intervention on indicators of discipline and school safety. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24(4), 495-511.
- Taylor-Greene, S., Brown, D., Nelson, L., Longton, J., Gassman, T., Cohen, J., Swartz, J., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Hall, S. (1997). School-wide behavioral support: Starting the year off right. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 7, 99-112.